



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,768	04/12/2006	Gero Nenninger	10191/4217	3790

26646 7590 07/07/2009
KENYON & KENYON LLP
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK, NY 10004

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHUONG P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3663

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/07/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/575,768	Applicant(s) NENNINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Chuong P. Nguyen	Art Unit 3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-21 and 27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' 01/23/2009 Amendment, which directly added new claims 27-29; and traversed the rejection of the claims of the 07/28/2008 Office Action are acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 14-21 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schramm et al (WO 9967114, equivalent to IDS reference – US 6,253,123).

Regarding claim 14, Schramm et al disclose in Fig 2-5 a method for rollover stabilization of a vehicle in a critical driving situation, comprising: ascertaining a mass of the vehicle (i.e. mass quantity M; second height quantity h_c) (Fig 3-4; Fig 5 “501”; col 2, line 66 – col 3, line 8; col 3, line 66 – col 4, line 5; col 9, lines 15-19; col 10, lines 45-60; col 11, line 59 – col 12, line 12; col 13, line 39+; claims 5-6); and executing a rollover stabilization algorithm (i.e. processor 309) as a function of the mass of the vehicle, the rollover stabilization algorithm intervening in a driver operation in a critical situation using an actuator (i.e. retarder 312; actuators 313*ixj*) in order to stabilize the vehicle (Abstract; Fig 3-4; Fig 5 “501, 505”; col 9, line 16 – col 13, line 62).

Art Unit: 3663

Regarding claim 15, Schramm et al disclose in Fig 3 the mass of the vehicle is estimated using an algorithm (i.e. mass quantity processor 308) (col 9, lines 15-19).

Regarding claim 16, Schramm et al disclose in Fig 2-5 the step of estimating information on a center of gravity of the vehicle (i.e. first height quantity h) (Fig 4; Fig 5 “501”; col 3, lines 21-57; col 6, lines 38+; col 11, line 59 – col 12, lines 12; col 13, line 39; claim 5), wherein the rollover stabilization algorithm (i.e. processor 309) is executed as a function of the vehicle mass and the information on the center of gravity of the vehicle (Fig 4; Fig 5 “501”; col 11, line 59 – col 13, line 45; claims 5-6).

Regarding claim 17, Schramm et al disclose in Fig 2-4 the information on the center of gravity of the vehicle is derived from an estimated characteristic speed (col 3, lines 21-57; col 6, line 38 - col 7, line 60; col 11; col 9, lines 20-47; col 11, line 58 - col 2, line 1).

Regarding claims 18 and 28, Schramm et al disclose in Fig 2-4 the information on the center of gravity of the vehicle is ascertained from a ratio of contact patch forces of opposite wheels during cornering (col 3, lines 21-57; col 6, line 38 - col 7, line 60; col 11; col 9, lines 20-47; col 11, line 58 - col 2, line 1; claim 5).

Regarding claim 19, Schramm et al disclose in Fig 2-4 the information on the center of gravity of the vehicle is ascertained from the estimated characteristic speed and from a ratio of the contact patch forces of opposite wheels during cornering (col 3, lines 21-57; col 6, line 38 - col 7, line 60; col 11; col 9, lines 20-47; col 11, line 58 - col 2, line 1; claim 5).

Regarding claim 20, Schramm et al disclose in Fig 3-5 one of an indicator variable or a characteristic property (i.e. reads on two limit values of vehicle speed v_r , v_k) of the rollover stabilization algorithm is determined as a function of one of the mass of the vehicle or the mass

Art Unit: 3663

of the vehicle and information on the center of gravity of the vehicle, the release of deactivation of the stabilization intervention being a function of the indicator variable (Fig 5 “501-503”; col 2, line 57 – col 4, line 5; col 10, line 45+; col 11, line 44 – col 13, line 62; claims 5-6).

Regarding claims 21 and 29, Schramm et al disclose in Fig 3-5 one of a control threshold value, a system deviation or a controlled variable (i.e. reads on two limit values of vehicle speed v_r , v_k) of the rollover stabilization algorithm is determined as a function of one of the mass of the vehicle or the mass of the vehicle and the information on the center of gravity of the vehicle (Fig 5 “501-503”; col 2, line 57 – col 4, line 5; col 10, line 45+; col 11, line 44 – col 13, line 62; claims 5-6).

Regarding claim 27, Schramm et al disclose in Fig 3-5 information is estimated on a center of gravity of the vehicle (i.e. first height quantity h) (Fig 4; Fig 5 “501”; col 3, lines 21-57; col 6, lines 38+; col 11, line 59 – col 12, lines 12; col 13, line 39; claim 5), wherein the rollover stabilization algorithm is executed as a function of the vehicle mass and the information on the center of gravity of the vehicle ((Fig 4; Fig 5 “501”; col 11, line 59 – col 13, line 45; claims 5-6), wherein the information on the center of gravity of the vehicle is at least one of derived from an estimated characteristic speed, and ascertained from a ratio of contact patch forces of opposite wheels during cornering (col 3, lines 21-57; col 6, line 38 - col 7, line 60; col 11; col 9, lines 20-47; col 11, line 58 - col 2, line 1; claim 5), and wherein one of an indicator variable or a characteristic property (i.e. reads on two limit values of vehicle speed v_r , v_k) of the rollover stabilization algorithm is determined as a function of one of the mass of the vehicle or the mass of the vehicle and information on the center of gravity of the vehicle, the release of deactivation

Art Unit: 3663

of the stabilization intervention being a function of the indicator variable (Fig 5 “501-503”; col 2, line 57 – col 4, line 5; col 10, line 45+; col 11, line 44 – col 13, line 62; claims 5-6).

4. While patent drawings are not drawn to scale, relationships clearly shown in the drawings of a reference patent cannot be disregarded in determining the patentability of claims. See In re Mraz, 59 CCPA 866, 455 F.2d 1069, 173 USPQ 25 (1972).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The cited prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuong P. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3445.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 3663

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CN

/Jack W. Keith/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3663